

REMARKS

Applicants and Applicants' representatives wish to thank Supervisory Patent Examiner Dinh and Examiner Flynn for the assistance extended during the personal interview held on July 30, 2003. In view of the discussion during the interview and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-37 are pending, with claims 1, 15, and 25 being independent. Claims 1-7, 9-17, 19-27, and 29-37 have been amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 13-16, 23-26, and 34-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Perholtz (5,732,212). Claims 1, 15, and 25 have been amended to obviate this rejection.

As amended, claims 1, 15, and 25 recite a method (claim 1) and a system (claims 15 and 25) for securing an accessible computer system that includes, *inter alia*, monitoring a computer system for connection transactions between multiple access requestors and multiple access providers using a switching component connected to the multiple access providers. Access by an attacking access requestor is denied when a number of connection transactions initiated by the attacking access requestor exceeds a configurable threshold number during a first configurable period of time using the switching component connected to multiple access providers.

As discussed in the interview on July 30, 2003, the present amendments overcome the rejections based on Perholtz. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 15, and 25 and claims 2-4, 13-14, 16, 23-24, 26, and 34-37 dependent therefrom.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5-12, 17-22, and 27-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perholtz in view of Allard (6,018,619). Claims 5-12, 17-22, and 27-33 depend from independent claims 1, 15, and 25. As noted above, the present amendments of claims 1, 15,

Applicant : Joseph Barrett et al.
Serial No. : 09/666,140
Filed : September 20, 2000
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No. 06975-131001 / Security 08

and 25 overcome the rejections based on Perholtz. Allard fails to remedy the Perholtz shortcomings, and is not relied upon in the Office Action for disclosure of such shortcomings. Thus, as discussed in the interview on July 30, 2003, the combination of Perholtz and Allard fails to describe or suggest the features of claims 1, 15, and 25, or the features of claims 5-12, 17-22, and 27-33 dependent therefrom. In view of the respective dependence upon claims 1, 15, and 25, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of claims 5-12, 17-22, and 27-33.